

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-17, 20, and 24 – 26 are pending, with claims 1, 8, and 17 being independent. Claims 1, 8 and 17 are amended to incorporate the features of dependant claims 21, 22 and 23 respectively. Claims 2, and 21 to 23 are cancelled. Claims 24 to 26 have been added herein. Support for the new claims and claim changes is found throughout the disclosure, including at least pages 31 to 32 of the specification, FIG. 10b and FIG. 10c. No new matter is added.

Applicant's undersigned representative thanks Primary Examiner Quang Nguyen and Examiner Kristie Shingles for the thoughtful courtesies and kind treatment afforded during the personal interview conducted on May 15, 2007. In the interview, Applicant's representative described the scope of the invention and provided proposed amendments. Examiner Nguyen suggested incorporating the features as shown in Fig. 10 b. into the independent claims. As a result, Applicant amended independent claims 1, 8, and 17 to include the features of a group of more than one internal search result that includes the internal search result is displayed in a first section of the displayed output, a group of more than one external search result that includes the external search result is displayed in a second section of the displayed output, and the first section and the second section are physically distinct from each other on the displayed output. Further, new dependant claims 24-26 are added to further clarify the feature of displayed output includes a warning text in the second section for the search result from external content.

### Claims 1 and 3-6

Claims 1 and 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,078,914 (Redfern) in view of (US Publication 2006/0149719) Harris. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to obviate the § 103(a) rejection.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method of displaying web site search results obtained from searching multiple electronic information stores without distinguishing the particular electronic information stores in the display, the method includes storing, at a web host, internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host. The methods also includes receiving at least one search term at the web host and comparing, at the web host, the search term with the

stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host to determine whether matches exist. An internal search result that is part of the stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host is obtained. Further, the search term is compared with electronic information that is external to the web host, that is distinct of the stored internal searchable content, and that is accessible to both the members of the web host and non-members, to determine whether matches exist. An external search result is obtained that includes the matches that are determined to exist. The method further includes displaying, in a single interface, output that includes the internal search results and the external search results. A group of more than one internal search result that includes the internal search result is displayed in a first section of the displayed output. A group of more than one external search result that includes the external search result is displayed in a second section of the displayed output. The first section and the second section are physically distinct from each other on the displayed output.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Redfern or Harris, either alone or together, fails to describe or properly suggest at least the features of : i) obtaining an internal search result that is part of the stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host, ii) a group of more than one internal search result that includes the internal search result is displayed in a first section of the displayed output, a group of more than one external search result that includes the external search result is displayed in a second section of the displayed output, and the first section and the second section are physically distinct from each other on the displayed output.

Redfern discloses a meta search engine that is directed to translate natural language queries into queries of multiple search engines. The search results from these multiple search engines are combined in one ranked list. *See, e.g., Redfern, Abstract, col. 4:7-28*. Redfern's meta search engine is used to process/translate search queries. It is clear that Redfern's meta search engine does not store internal searchable content, nor does it require membership for access. Redfern's meta search engine is not comparable to a web host.

The Office Action indicates that Redfern implies requiring membership to access a search engine with an example of a proprietary search engine. See, Office Action, paragraph IV. However, such assertion is improper. "Proprietary" means "something that is used, produced, or marketed under exclusive legal right of the inventor or maker." See, e.g. <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?va=proprietary>. "Proprietary" does not imply a requirement of being members or subscribers to access information. Redfern's meta search engine requires no membership for access. Accordingly, Redfern fails disclose the features of i) obtaining an internal search result that is part of the stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host.

Further, the display of Redfern's meta search engine does not differentiate whether the search results are obtained internally or externally: Redfern displays all search results in one combined list. Therefore, Redfern fails to disclose ii) a group of more than one internal search result that includes the internal search result is displayed in a first section of the displayed output, a group of more than one external search result that includes the external search result is displayed in a second section of the displayed output, and the first section and the second section are physically distinct from each other on the displayed output.

Additionally, the Office Action relies on Harris to teach a web host with internal content. In Harris, a subscriber maintains a list of search sources and a dictionary. The dictionary is used as a "Query Translator" to customize any user search term to customized queries for respective search sources in the subscriber's list. See, e.g., *Harris, Abstract, FIG. 4*. It is true that Harris' subscriber server stores a dictionary for a subscriber. However, Harris's dictionary only includes formatting information for different search engines. Harris's dictionary is not searchable content that will be directly compared to the search term and will not become part of "an internal search result", as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Harris fails to disclose or properly suggest the feature of i) obtaining an internal search result that is part of the stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host.

Further, Harris is configured to "... receive and compile search results from broadcast dictionaries, and transfer a single composite search result to the initiating website..." , See,

Harris, paragraph 0018 (emphasis added). Clearly, Harris's "composite search result" teaches away from ii) the internal search result being displayed in a first section, the external search result being displayed in a second section, and the first section and the second section being physically distinct from each other.

Additionally, the Office Action also relies on US, 370,527 (Singhal) for teaching "displaying results from the web host in a first section and displaying results from other source other than the web host in a second section". See, *Office Action paragraph VI*. However, Singhal's teaching also fails to distinguish "internal" and "external" search results. The directed portion of Singhal discloses the equal display of multiple search engines, all external to the meta search engine.

Further, Singhal's meta search engine is not a web host. Singhal's meta search engine does not store internal searchable content requiring membership to access. Consequently, Singhal has no intent to distinct the display internal vs. external contents into physically separate sections. Finally, Singhal "combines the results obtained from each of the search engines into a single ranked list", See, e.g., *Singhal, Abstract*, which also teaches away from the feature of displaying search results in two physically distinct sections.

Accordingly, Singal also fails to describe or proper suggest at least the features of : i) obtaining an internal search result that is part of the stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host, and ii) a group of more than one internal search result that includes the internal search result is displayed in a first section of the displayed output, a group of more than one external search result that includes the external search result is displayed in a second section of the displayed output, and the first section and the second section are physically distinct from each other on the displayed output.

Based on the reasons above, Redfern, Harris and Singhal, either alone or together, fails to describe or proper suggest at least the features of: i) obtaining an internal search result that is part of the stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host, and ii) a group of more than one internal search result that includes the internal search result is displayed in a first section of the displayed output, a group of more than one external search result that

includes the external search result is displayed in a second section of the displayed output, and the first section and the second section are physically distinct from each other on the displayed output.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 1, and 3-6.

**Claims 8-14, 16, 17, 20, and 24 -26**

Like amended independent claim 1, each of amended independent claims 8 and 17 recites i) comparing, at the web host, the search term with the stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host to determine whether matches exist and obtaining an internal search result that is part of the stored internal searchable content accessible only to members of the web host. ii) a group of more than one internal search result that includes the internal search result is displayed in a first section of the displayed output, a group of more than one external search result that includes the external search result is displayed in a second section of the displayed output, and the first section and the second section are physically distinct from each other on the displayed output. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claims 8 and 17, and their respective dependent claims, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

All claims are believed in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.


Applicant : Surendra GOEL et al.  
Serial No. : 09/749,627  
Filed : December 28, 2000  
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-147001 / Search 03

The fee in the amount of \$120 in payment of a one-month extension of time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 05/30/2007

  
W. Karl Renner  
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331